

<i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i>	Application No. 10/579,232	Applicant(s) POLLET ET AL.	
	Examiner N. EDWARDS	Art Unit 1794	

All Participants:

(1) N. EDWARDS.

(2) Jeffery Bousquet (57,771).

Date of Interview: 16 September 2008

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.
(4) _____.

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:
Claims of record

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/N Edwards/
Primary Examiner

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was notified of the Language Problem with the claims and spec. The claim 1 preamble, for example is not commensurate with the body of the claim. Claim 1 recite a composite yarn but the body of the claim appear to be a composite or island in the sea fiber (US textile Dictionary). In the US a composite yarn does not correspond to the body of claim 1. Note once the yarn filaments are separated and uniformly distributed in a polymer matrix in claim 1 it is no longer a filament yarn but are filaments or fibers perse in a polymer matrix.